GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

1905.
(Miscellaneous)

File No. 13

Serial Nos. 1–9

Papers Filed.

Month ~~April~~ 1908.

SUBJECT.

Directs that the Arachi should pay the whole amount stolen in the Sri Prasanna Venkataramana temple at Kelagote near Chitaldrug town and that the Dharmadarsi should be exempted, the amount already taken should be refunded to him.

PREVIOUS REFERENCES.	LATER REFERENCES.

MUZRAI SECRETARIAT

OFFICE NOTE.

File No.

SUBJECT.

Theft in the Sri Prasanna Venkatarāmana swami temple at Kelagote near Chitaldrug town.

From

The Deputy Commissioner, Chitaldrug District.

Letter No. 238, Dated 31st October 1905.

In the letter cited above, the Deputy Commissioner ~~reports~~ of the Chitaldrug District reports that the temple of the Sri Prasanna Venkata-ramanaswami at Kelagote near Chitaldrug town was broken ~~open into~~ probably on the night of the 16th October 1905, and 9 articles of the estimated value of Rs 8/- were lost, and that he (the Deputy Commissioner) has issued strict orders to the Police to use their utmost efforts to detect the culprits

File No. of Muzrai Secretariat.

2. The Deputy Commissioner further states that the temple is about a mile distant from the Chitaldrug town, and is situated in a lonely place, and that it does not seem to be watched by any of the temple servants during nights owing to the insufficiency of the Establishment. He also says that as a precautionary measure, the valuable jewels of the temple have been secured in the Taluk Treasury, the Utsava Vigraha and the clothes pertaining to the can have been removed to the Sri Lakshmi Narayanaswami temple in the Chitaldrug Town.

3. It is stated that the Sri Prasanna Venkataramanaswami has not been worshipped ever since the occurrence of theft, that as large numbers of devotees will be coming visiting the temple during the current Karthika masa, the Deputy Commissioner solicits that Samprokshane may be performed to the idol at an estimated cost of Rs 15-6-3, without which purificatory ceremony, the daily worship of the idol cannot be duly performed. He proposes that the charge may be met from the savings of the temple, which

Maharai Secretariat. File No. of 190

amount to Rs 464-8 10 as per Treasury
Officer's certificate enclosed in his letter
Submitted with the usual draft
Draft Lr.

File No.	of 19	Mayor's Secretary

Muz. 81]

Muzrai Secretariat. | File No. of 190

4. In para 2 of Govt Pro: no 2163-4 Dy 8th November 1905 the Dy: Commissioner was requested to explain the difference of the amount between the Treasury Officer's and the Amildar.

5. The Dy: Comr reports that the Treasury Officer's figure includes only the Muzrai funds whereas the Amildar's figure includes the following items:-

1 The Muzrai funds 464-8-10.

2 The investment in the Govt of India Securities 831-11-1

3. the Savings Bank Deposit including interest.

Submitted

This requires no orders

Js
1/8/06

File
1/8/06

File No. of 190 Murray Secretariat

Muz 8A]

Muzrai Secretariat. | File No. of 190

Note continued.

6 With reference to paras 1 2 and 3, Govt Pro: No 2163-4, dated 8th November 1905, were issued requesting the Deputy Commissioner to use his best efforts to detect ~~the culprits~~ and bring ~~to~~ justice ~~to~~ the culprits who had committed the theft in the Sri Prasanna Venkatāramanaswami temple & to recover from the temple servants the sum of Rs 8/- being the value of the estimated loss of the institution. The estimate for Rs 15. 6. 3 submitted by the Deputy Commissioner for the performance of Samprokshane in the temple was also sanctioned in the Proceedings referred to.

7. The Deputy Commissioner now reports that in spite of all possible endeavours, the culprits were not detected and the Police submitted a 'B' Report in the case.

As regards the recovery of the sum of Rs 8/-, the Deputy Commissioner reports that Sri Gale Amildar

GPB—3,000—22-6-06

of the Chitaldrug Taluk Mr. T. Ramachandra Rao recommended that Rs 4- might be received from the Archak and the balance of Rs 4- from the Dharmadarsi and stated that though the latter was not a paid servant of the temple he could be considered as one of the temple servants as he was in the enjoyment of a temple inam land endowed as Dantasame to Brahmins during the car festival and controlling the puja in the temple. This was approved by the then Deputy Commissioner Mr. K. Ramanuja [illegible] and though the Archak and the Dharmadarsi protested, yet on their being informed that they would be dismissed if they did not ack up to the order, they paid the amounts which are held in deposit.

9 The Dharmadarsi subsequently petitioned the Deputy Commissioner praying for the refund of the sum of Rs 4/- paid by him, as he was not responsible for the loss - The Deputy Commissioner Mr. Champaik [illegible] is of opinion that neither of the Archak nor the Dharmadarsi

Muzrai Secretariat. | File No. of 190

is responsible, as the temple is situated in a lonely place, a mile or two from the Chitaldrug town, and has no watchman or other servant appointed therefor. The Archak attends to the worship in the daytime and after locking the temple, to the town. That Officer therefore expresses the opinion that even if the Archak is held responsible for the loss, the Dharmadarsi cannot be so as the Archak alone keeps the temple keys and the Dharmadarsi cannot have access into the temple when its doors are not opened by the Archak. He further states that the Assistant Superintendent of Police observes in his memo that the crime seems to have been committed by the Archak with the intention of getting the Dharmadarsi into trouble. Under these circumstances, the Deputy Commissioner considers that the Archak alone should be held responsible and not the Dharmadarsi also, who ought not to be looked upon as a temple servant.

Submitted with a draft.

GPB—3,000—22-6-06

File No. of 190 | Muzrai Secretariat.

Note Continued —

The Inam Superintendent forwards a Copy of the Inam Register pertaining to the grant of lands for feeding brahmans &c in the temple as requested — Rc 69 dt 4th Jan 1908

From the Inam Registers, it is observed that the inam has been Confirmed to the temple and Continued to J Shanmachar as long as he performs the duties of feeding brahmans to the extent of 3½ Pagodas at the car procession and of Controlling the poojay in the Sri Venkatacamana Swamis temple at Velagode. Satisfactorily

The inam is also Confirmed free of tax so long as the pagoda is in existence and the Conditions of the grant are fulfilled.

The question for orders is whether the Dharmadarsi should be exempted

Muzrai Secretariat. | File No. of 190

from making good the loss of the property. He enjoys a portion of the inam lands of the temple for conducting certain services and as such, has to be considered as a temple servant. In cases of theft the responsibility of all temple servants to make good the loss is insisted upon. The D/comm.r says that the Dharmadarsi has no access to the temple when the Archak locks it & that therefore he shd. not be held responsible for the loss.

Submitted for orders

4/29/08

Muzrai Secretary's Remarks:-

Strictly speaking neither the Archak nor the Dharmadarsee can be held

liable to make good the loss because the theft of the properties has not been proved against them but the losses which occur in Temples are made good by the Temple servants under the usage of the Muzrai Department which has been in force for many years past. The cases cited in Govt. Pro: No. 51-60, dated 3rd November 1892 show that this usage was upheld by the former Chief Commissioner of Mysore and by subsequent orders of Government. There is no doubt therefore about holding the Archak responsible. But in this case there is the further question whether the Dharmadarsi can also be made to bear a portion of the loss considering him to be a Temple servant or Temple official. Although ordinary Dharmadarsis cannot be considered to be Temple servants still the Dharmadarsi in the present case appears to be one who holds Inam lands confirmed to

Muz. 8A]

Muzrai Secretariat. | File No. 15-256 of 190

him at the Inam Settlement for feeding Brahmins at the car procession and for controlling the Puja &c of the temple. He is thus intimately connected with the working of the temple and I think he should be held responsible just as much as the Archak. The amount recovered from the Archak and the Dharmadarsi should not I think be refunded to them.

There is no doubt hardship in the case but the Rules of the Department has to be enforced.

295 Submitted to the 2nd Councillor } Thanikachalam 29th January 1908.

443/31.1.08 Properly speaking the Dharmadarsi through enjoying a temple Inam land for a specific purpose cannot

File No. of 190 | Muzrai Secretariat.

be called a temple servant.
The temple & all its belongings
are in the possession of the
Archak alone who performs
the pooja & locks the temple
keeping the key with himself
The Dharmadarsi is not charged
with any of the functions of
the Temple servant. I am
therefore inclined to agree with
Mr Chengiah chetty, the more
especially as the Asst Supdt
Police thinks that the theft was
engineered by the Archak to
get the Dharmadarsi into trouble
The Archak should pay the Wake
Amount & the Dharmadarsi
exempted

I agree
31/1/08.

7838
31.1.08

Submitted to the Dewan
3, 08
7/2/1908

Muz. 8A]

Muzrai Secretariat. | File No. of 190

344 Subd to the 2nd Counsellor for perusal.
10/3/08

Seen
10/3/08

Read 11/3/08

Draft accd by
11/3/08

Draft submitted.
5/4/08

GPB—3,000—22-6-06

File No.	of 190	Muzrai Secretariat.

SM

1905

1981
3.11.05

RA

Ds
2/11/05

From
The Deputy-Commissioner
Chitaldrug District

To
The Secretary to the Govt: of Mysore,
Mujrai Department,
Bangalore

Dated 31st October } 1905
Despatched
Received

General No. 238
No.

Enclosure No. 1 file of V.P. & a Treasury Certificate

Reporting upon the theft of certain property in the Sri Prasanna Venkataramanaswami Temple near the Chitaldrug Town and Soliciting sanction to an Estimate for Samprokshna Ceremonies.

No 238/Encl file of VP. Deputy Commissioner's Office
With 1 Certificate. Chitaldrug District
Dated Chitaldrug 31st October 1905.

From
H. Ramamjaiengar Esquire
Deputy Commissioner,
Chitaldrug District

To
L. Ananthaswami Rao Esquire B.A.
Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
Mujrai Department, Bangalore.

Sir,

I have the honor to state that from an Hillah received in this office from the Amildar of the Chitaldrug Taluk on the 28th Instant, it would appear that the temple of Sri Prasanna Venkataramanaswami at Kalapete, a suburb of the town of Chitaldrug was broken into, probably on the night of the 16th Instant, and that the marginally noted articles on the Mula Vigraha Estimated at Rs 8 are missing.

1 ಕಂ 25.
1 ಪಂಚಲೋಹದ್ದು ಕಿರೀಟ.
1 ಪ್ರಸನ್ನವೆಂಕಟರಮಣಸ್ವಾಮಿ ಪಂಚಲೋಹ
ಮೂರ್ತಿಯ ಪ್ರಭಾವಳಿ ಸಮೇತ
1 ಪಂಚಲೋಹದ ಶಂಖ 2.
1 ಪಾದ
1 ಪಂ ಮುಖದ್ದು
1 ಪಂಚಲೋಹದ ಪ್ರಭಾವಳಿ ಸಮೇತ ಸಣ್ಣ
2 ಪಂಚಲೋಹದ ಬಿಲ್ಲೆ

2 This temple is about a mile from the Chitaldrug

Town and is situated in a lonely place. The temple does not appear to have been watched by any of the temple servants during nights owing to the insufficiency of the Establishment. As a precautionary measure, therefore, the valuable jewels of the temple had been secured in the Taluk Treasury.

3. As a further precautionary measure the Utsavavigraha and the clothes pertaining to the Car have also been since removed to Sri Laxmmaranganaswami Temple which is situated in the Chitaldrug Town.

4 Strict orders have been issued to the Police to use their utmost efforts to detect the culprits

5. The idol has not been worshipped Eversince the theft occurred

in the temple and the necessary Sam-
prokshana ceremonies have to be
performed as early as possible as
this is the "Karthika Masa" when devotees
usually attend the temple worship every
day in large numbers. The cost
of the Samprokshana is estimated
at Rs 15-6-3 as per enclosed Kannada
list furnished by the Amildar. I solicit
the favor of very early sanction of
Government to this estimate, the
Charge being met from the Inuzrai
Funds at credit of the Institution.

6 Report No 286 dated 27th October
1905 with its enclosures from the Amildar
of Chitaldrug is herewith submitted together
with the Credit Certificate.

I have the honor to be,
Sir
Your most obedient Servant.

Deputy Commissioner
Dist.

Murasi

Read:-

Letter no 238, dated 31st October 1905, from the Deputy Commr., Chitaldrug Dt reporting that the temple of the Sri Prasanna Venkata-ramanaswami ~~temple~~ at Kelagote near Chitaldrug town was broken into on the night of the 16th Oct. 1905 and property of the value of Rs 8/- was lost, and also submitting for sanction an Estimate amounting to Rs 18- 6- 3, for performing the Samprokshane, without which purificatory ceremony, the idol should not be duly worshipped

---

Order thereon

Recorded. It is surprising

The matter is urgent
Issue G.L.
6/11/05

No. 2163-4 D/8. 11. 05.
Exe. 14/11/6.
Exe. 6/.

that such a daring theft
was committed so near the
head quarters of the District
without fear of detection
The Dy Commr is requested to
use his best efforts to detect
the culprits and bring them
to justice. At the same time, the
temple servants should be held responsible for the loss and be asked
to make good the
amount.

2. The Estimate for Rs 15 6. 3
submitted by the Dy Commr
for the performance of Sandprokshana
is sanctioned, the charge being
met from the savings of Rs 464-8-10
~~reappropriation~~ available at
the credit of the Institution
as per Treasury Officer's certificate
dt 30th Oct 05. The Auditor reports
that a sum of Rs: 1358-0-3 was at the
credit of the temple at the end of Augt last
The discrepancy should be explained by the Dy Comr
and the correct amount reported.

Secretary 6/11/05
Inam Dept.

6/11/05

To
The Dy Commr, Chitaldrug Dt
Ref & encd Estimate & other Enclosures
one - with a copy of the Est

1905-06 515

From

To The Deputy Commissioner, of the Kistnadong District.

Dated

Despatched 17th May 1906

Received

General No. 5320

No.

Enclosure No.

Government Proceedings

No. 2163-4 dated the 8th November 1905 Sanctioning an Estimate for Rs 15-6-3 for the performance of Samprokshanam etc in the Sri Prasanna Venkatramanaswami temple at Kolagotu near Kolluru requesting him to explain the discrepancy ~~shown in the amounts at the credit of the institution by the Amildar and the Treasury officer~~

Has the

draw attention to the above and

request ~~the submission of the~~ an early reply
~~on all the points~~
~~Report therein called for at an~~

~~early date.~~

By Order,

Secretary
~~The~~ War Department

11/5/06

Muz. 5]

GOVT. OF H. H. THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

190

From

The Secretary to the Government of H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore,

To The Muzrai Department.

The Dy. Commissioner, Chitaldrug District.

Dated 18th

Despatched July 06.

Received

Enclosures No.

General No. 375
M. No.

Para 2 of Govt. Pro.

This Office No. 2163-4 dated 8th Nov 1905 requesting him to explain certain discrepancy in the matter of the savings available at the credit of the Sri Prasanna Venkata Ramana Swami temple at Holesale & subsequent reminder marginally noted.

No. 5320-2/175-06.

Note 2.

Has the honor to draw attention to the above and to request ~~to be informed as to what action has been taken in the matter and when a reply may be expected.~~ the favor of a very early reply in the matter.

By Order,

Secretary,
Muzrai Department.

18/7/06

A. 16/7. 16/7/06

Ans A

94

1906

MYSORE GOVERNMENT
460

From N. Ramanuja Iyengar Esquire,
Deputy Commissioner,
Chitaldroog District

To L. Ananthasami Rao Esquire B.A.,
Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore,
Muzrai Department,
Bangalore.

Dated
Despatched 24 Dec 1906
Received

General No. 574
No.

Enclosure No.

Ref
24/12/06

Para 2 of Government order No. 2163-4 dated 8th November 1905 calling for an explanation for the difference of amount as reported by the Amildar and District Treasury Officer to be available at the Credit of Sri Prasanna Venkataramanaswami temple at Kelagote in the Chitaldroog Taluk.

Filed
1/8/06

With reference to the above has the honor to state that the amount of Rs. 464-8-10 thereon in the District Treasurey officer's Certificate, Constitutes the muzrai funds only while the figure furnished by the amildar includes, besides the muzrai funds, the investments in the Government of India Securities (831-11-1) and the Savings Bank Deposits with the

current interest thereon. Hence the apparent discrepancy

Yours Respectfully,

Deputy Commissioner

Chickasaw District

No. 217.

Office of the Deputy Commissioner,
Chitaldrug District.
Dated Chitaldrug, 9th November 1907.

From

Venkatachalapathi Chetty Esquire, B.A.,
Deputy Commissioner,
Chitaldrug District.

MYSORE GOVERNMENT 2234 MUZRAI SECRETARIAT

To

Rao Bahadur A. Ananthaswami Rao Esquire, B.A.,
Secretary to the Government of H.H.
the Maharaja of Mysore, Muzrai Department,
Bangalore.

Sir,

With reference to [illegible] dated 8th November 1907 [illegible] should be made to [illegible] certain articles worth Rs 8/- in the Sri [illegible] ramaswami temple at Belagola and that the temple servants should be held responsible for the loss, I have the honour to state that in spite of all possible endeavours, the [illegible] were not detected and the Police submitted a 'B' report in this case.

2. The Amildar recommended that of the value of property lost, Rs 4/- may be recovered from the archak and Rs 4/- from the Dharmadarsi, and stated that though the latter is not a paid servant he should be considered as one of the temple servants as he is in the enjoyment of a temple inam land endowed

feeding the Brahmans at the car procession and controlling the puja etc. in the temple. This was approved of by Mr. N. Ramanujam Iyengar, the then Deputy Commissioner. Both the archak and the Dharmadarsi protested against the order but on their being informed that they would be dismissed if they did not act up to the order, they paid the amount which is held in deposit.

3. The Dharmadarsi Sreenivasachar has subsequently put in a petition praying for the refund of the sum of Rs 4/- he had paid as he is not responsible for the loss. The records in the enquiry show that there is no evidence on which either party may be accused of any culpable neglect. The temple is situated in a lonely place a furlong or mile or two from the Thirukadaiyur town. There are no watchmen nor servants to guard it during nights. There is only one archak who comes to the temple in the day time, and after closing the temple he goes back to the town. I do not therefore consider it right to hold them responsible for the loss, but I presume the previous order was based upon the late Chief Commissioner's circular enjoining that boxes of temple property should be made good

by all the temple servants. Even in such a case, I do not see how the Dharmadarsi can be held responsible for it also.

4. With the [illegible] is in the direct charge of the archak with whom the servants and the Dharmadarsi has no access to the temple [illegible]. The archak does not [illegible] Superintendent of Police [illegible] so that the crime seems to [illegible] himself with the intention of getting the Dharmadarsi into trouble. Under the circumstances, I consider that it is only the archak [illegible] who responsible and not both, as in [illegible] cannot be looked upon as a temple servant.

5. The Vernacular correspondence ending with [illegible] No. 869 dated 27th September 1907 from the Assistant Commissioner, Tirukoilur Division is herewith submitted for favour of reference and disposal.

I have the honour to be
Sir
Your most obedient servant.

Mahomed Rafiq
for Deputy Commissioner
Tiruchirapalli

Draft for approval.

Muz. 1 A]

190

From

13-1905

To

The Superintendent
of Inam Settlements in Mysore

Dated

Despatched

Received

General No.
No.

Enclosure No.

Has the name to request be furnished with.
~~that~~ a copy of the detailed Inam Register, pertaining to the Inam land in the Kelagote village of the Chitaldrug Taluk as Inam to Sramanas for feeding Brahmins during the ensuing festival of and controlling the puja in the Sri Prasanna Venkataramanaswamie temple at Kelagote, under Inam Title deed No 46 dated 9th Sept. 1868.

2. An early compliance is requested.

By Order

GPB—8,000—21-7-03

Secretary
to
Government

Inam Superintendent's Office
Bangalore, dated 4th January 1908

No 69
Genl.

From

The Superintendent of Inam
Settlements in Mysore

To

The Secretary to the Government
of Mysore, Muzrai Department

Sir,

As requested in your docket No 2773 dated 12th December 1907, I have the honor to forward herewith, a copy of the Inam Register pertaining to the grant of lands for feeding brahmins etc., in the Sri Prasanna Venkataramanaswami temple at Kelagote, Chitaldroog Taluk.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant

D Venkobha

Superintendent of Inam
Settlements in Mysore.

Copy of the Inam Register

~~Register of Inams~~ in the village of Pillekeranahully in the

CLASS, EXTENT AND VALUE OF INAM

Number of case or entire holding under one grant in this village	General class to which the Inam belongs	Survey No. and name of field or fields comprised in the grant Dry, wet or garden	Extent	
			Local measure. Even where the local measure is in acres, guntas, and annas, it is to be entered in this column	Measure in acres and their fractions in decimals
1	2	3	4	5
1	Devadaya			
Title Deed No.	146.	Wet No. 6	2 8 0 0 0 0 = 2.89	3.65

Title Deed No. 996
Date of prepn. 1-1-69
Date of issue —
Folio —

Sammat of Chittaldroog in the Taluk of Chittaldroog

		DESCRIPTION, TENURE AND	
Old assessment	Survey assessment	Description of Inam If for service, it is to be stated whether the service is continued. If for tanks, buildings, etc, whether they are efficiently kept up Hereditary or for life	Whether free of tax, etc, or liable to quit-rent, i. e, jodi, etc, amount of latter to be entered
Where no survey has been made and no assessment fixed by Government the cess paid by the rayats to the Inamdar, or the average assessment of similar Government land, should be entered in column 7			
6	7	8	9
		Old extent as per Amildar's account & Chittah of 1834.	Scale Survey
		Dry - 40 cand 14 coods	536 acres 1 cood. 60
		wet - 8 cand 16 do	36 do
		Garden - - - - -	Garden 30 do } do. 38.
		Akshya Pymaishy is not available	
Brahmins		For feeding Brahmins to the extent of 3½ Pagodas at the car procession and for controlling the Poojay &c of the Temple of Venkatramana Swamy of Kellgoty.	Free.
		Devastanum said to be in good order, and service rendered.	

DOCUMENT IN SUPPORT OF THE INAM

By whom granted and in what year	Written instruments in support of the claim, original sannad, all miscellaneous documents, and other proofs of long possession. In this column it should be stated whether the Inam is held with or without grant, whether the grant is produced or lost, etc., and the general specification of terms of all documents produced should be given.
10	11
Unknown.	None. One Yaksed from Amildar to Shekdar dated in 1849, stating that Jatachar's son Sreenivasachar has consented to control the processions and people in the car festival to the extent of 3½ Pagodas or one-half of the Beriz and enjoy the other half as remuneration for those services and directing that those terms should be carried out. One Ditto from Amildar dated in 1849, directing the issue of water for the cultivation of the Inam land. One ditto dated in 1861, from Amildar to the same effect. One endorsement from Deputy Superintendent of Chittaldroog No. 373 dated in 1863 saying that the Amildar has been ordered to carry out the Commissioner's orders.

of

NAME AND RELATIONSHIP OF ORIGINAL GRANTEE AND

Name of original grantee	Name entered in the register prepared by Poorniah up to 1810	Name entered in the accounts subsequent to 1810
12	13	14
unknown.	— " — —	Swalpa ~~Swalpa~~ Inamdy account of 1841. Vencataramanaswa 1 Candi 8 Cood wet Survey account 1867 Same 3 acres - 26 Goontas

of the

OF SUBSEQUENT AND PRESENT HOLDERS

Particulars regarding present owner. If the main has been subdivided, the name, etc., of each sharer should be entered in the columns			
Residence, name and age, etc.	Relation to original grantee or subsequent registered holders	Surviving heirs of the present incumbent	If unconnected with the original holders, possession how obtained, and in what year
15	16	17	18
Kelagotay Prasanna Venkataramana Swamy. N. B. The Taloor officials manage the Temple. The land is in the special & hereditary occupation of T. Shamachar of Chittaldroog who performs the requisite services.	—	—	

Division

LENGTH OF POSSESSION	
Abstract of the orders already issued by the Commissioner or the Superintendent of the Division on lapses regarding validity or excess of the Inam Assistant's opinion and recommendation	~~Review by the Special Assistant and confirmation by the Inam Commissioner~~
19	

The Inam is stated to be continued from time immemorial free of rent, and to have been at first in the possession of Poojary Veneatachar & his family. There is no doubt about its antiquity, as may be seen at once from the 1st entry in the accounts named in column 14.

It would appear that about 1849. the Inam which had been formerly in the possession of the Poojary, fell beauzar to the detriment of the service in the temple The then Amildar Bheemarow received a tender from Srinivasachar to the effect that he will manage the temple affairs, and feed the devotees of the temple at the Car festivals to the extent of a moiety of the revenue of the land (3½ Canteroy Pagodas) in return for the enjoyment of the Inam This was accepted, and the land made over to him, as per Takeed in column 11. Subsequently, the question went up to the Inoozrai Department of the Commissioner's office, and an order was issued by the Commissioner under the signature of Colonel Cunningam, No 3 dated 31st May 1852. approving of the above arrangement and directing the Amildar to see that the terms of the agreement of Sreenivasachar — (Engrossed in K Mootchelka) are enforced. In

GPB—1,000 books of 2 sheets each—9-8-06.

1863

1863, it was complained by the son of the said Sreenivasa Char (party in column 15) that the Talook officials demanded a larger contribution from him than was mentioned in the original Takeed (3½ Pagodas) for feeding people at the car Festival, where upon ~~Captain~~ Captain Cole, Deputy Superintendent issued an order to Amildar No. 685 dated 30th July 1863 to the effect that the said individual should be called upon to contribute only the amount stipulated for, & since ratified by order of the Commissioner,

The poojary of the Temple, Krishnachar complained that the above party, Shama-char did not perform his duties satisfactorily & is requesting that this Inam land may be put in his possession. On enquiring I find that the latter (Shama-char) is regularly contributing the stipulated amount for feeding, and that he superintends the Temple concerns. Under the foregoing circumstances, I beg to recommend that the Inam be confirmed to the Temple, & continued to Shamachar as long as he performs the duties specified in column 8, satisfactorily.

(Signed) Illegible
Assistant.

27-5-68

Shamachar, since writing the above, complained that as the former Beriz of the land was more than that imposed by the Survey, he was

---

His urzee to the Inam Commr was forwarded to me for disposal with docket No. 22 dated 15th June 1868. I have nothing more to add to what I have already said on the subject.

(Signed) Illegible
Assistant
23-6-68.

---

must mention in the survey accounts only in the Takeed

was liable to pay one-half of the former for feeding people at the festival - But as the assessment assistant is now reduced to 7 Rupees, he may be allowed to pay only a half of the latter. I conceive that this demand is but fair; But I am doubtful whether it can be satisfied. In case of his request being tenable. I beg to recommend it for the favorable consideration of the Inam Commissioner, as it is hard on the party to make him pay more for an Inam land, than it would be the case, had it been a Sirkar land.

27-5-68.

/Signed/ [illegible]
Assistant.

As apparently the Inam is presumable to be 50 years old, one fourth Quit Rent is chargable, which seems to be a very fair rate, having in view the necessity of making provision for the costly duty required from the occupant. The demand on this Inami is therefore 7 Rs ÷ 4 = 1-12-0 - No excess - as per scale.

August 1-68 /Signed/ [illegible]
Assistant.

Review by the Special Assistant and confirmation by the Inam Commissioner

20.

I would subject this Inam to no tax at all.
The appropriation of the rent of this Inam was sanctioned by the Commissioner of the province, and any invalidity arising from its not having been clearly established as a grant of 50 years' duration is cured by the above mentioned order of the Commissioner dated 31st May 1852 signed by his Secretary Col. Cunningam.

I recommend the Inam to be confirmed free of tax so long as the pagoda is in existance and the conditions of the grant are fulfilled.

From the explanation furnished by the assistant the present holder of the Inam or trustee mentioned in column 15, need not be disturbed as he is reported to be performing the duties assigned to him by the Amildar and Deputy Superintendent. The complaint of the Poojari need not be reopened.

/Signed/ B. Gopaliah
Spl. Assistant

8-9-68

Confirmed free of tax.

/Signed/ J. Clark
Inam Commr.

7th October 68.

"Copy"

Compd. D.V.K.
Superintendent's office
4th January 1908
also 4th December 1907

D. Venkata Rao
Supt. of Inam in

By resolution
Orders have been
passed. Put up with
Kelasole file & give
W/9.3.08

3667

Draft as per notes

Muzumdar 2/4 8L9

Read,

Govt Endo no 2163-H dated 8th November 1905 requesting the ~~Collector~~ Dy Commr Chitaldrug to use his best efforts to detect and bring to justice the culprits who had committed the theft in the Sri Sirasanna Venkataramana Swamy temple at Kelagote near Chitaldrug town and to recover from the temple servants the sum of Rs 8/- being the estimated value of the lost articles ~~estimated loss of~~ the instn

Letter no 214 dated 9th November 1904 from the Dy Commr, Chitaldrug Distt. reporting on the above.

Letter no 69 dated 14th January 1908 from the Superintendent

Settlements in Mysore forwarding
Copy of the Inam Register
pertaining to the grant
of lands ~~for feeding Brahmins~~ etc
~~to~~ the Rais temple

Order thereon no. Dy.

In the order read above,
the Dy. Commissioner was
requested to use his best
endeavours to detect and
bring to justice, the culprits
who had committed the theft
in the Sri Prasanna Venkata-
ramanaswamy temple at
Kelagote. ~~with reference to~~
~~this point,~~ ~~that~~ that officer
reports in the letter read
above, that in spite of
of all possible endeavours,
the culprits were not
detected and that the

No. 4770-1 A/25.4.08,
Executive

in the case. ~~These points~~ We
Communication is recorded

2) As regards the recovery of the sum of Rs 8/ being estimated the value of the ~~estimates~~ articles lost, the Dy Commr reports that the late Amildar of the Chitaldrug Taluk (Mr T Ramachendra Rao) recommended that Rs 4/ might be recovered from the Archak and Rs 4/ from the Dharmadarsi and states that though the latter was not a paid servant of the temple, he should be considered as one of the temple servants as he was in the enjoyment of a temple inam land endowed for Santarpane To Brahmins during the car festival and for controlling the c

in the temple. He further
reports that this was
approved by the then
Dy. Commr Mr H Ramanujiengar.
and that though the
Archak and the Dharmadarsi
protested, yet on their
being informed that they
would be dismissed
if they did not act
up to the order, they
paid the amounts which
are held in deposit.
The Dharmadarsi subsequently
petitioned the Dy. Commr.
praying for the refund of
the sum of Rs 4/ paid
by him as he was not
responsible for the loss
The Dy. Commr. Mr. Lokanjiah
briefly is of opinion that
neither the Archak nor

The Dharmadarsi is responsible, as the temple is situated in a lonely place, a mile or two from the Vahitalavng town, nor and has no watchman or other servant appointed therefor. The Archak is reported to attend to the worship and after locking the temple, comes back to the town. That officer therefore expresses the opinion that even if the Archak is held responsible for the loss, the Dharmadarsi cannot be so held as the Archak alone keeps the temple keys and the Dharmadarsi cannot have access to the temple when its doors are

by the Archak. He further states that the Assistant Supdt of Police observes in his memo that the crime seems to have been committed by the Archak with the intention of getting the Dharmadarsi into trouble. The Dy. Commr therefore considers that the Archak alone should be held responsible, and not the Dharmadarsi also who ought not to be looked upon as a temple servant.

3 The Govt observe that properly speaking the Dharmadarsi, though enjoying a temple inam land for a specific purpose,

Cannot be called a temple servant. The temple and all its belongings are in the possession of the Archak alone who performs the Puja and locks the temple keeping the key with himself. The Dharmadarsi is not charged with any of the functions of a temple servant. The Govt are therefore pleased to agree with the Dy. Commr Mr Lobengiah Chetty, the more especially as the Assistant Supdt of Police thinks that the theft was engineered by the Archak to get the

~~into~~ direct that the
~~note trouble then~~ Anchak

should ~~therefore~~ pay

the whole amount

and that the Dharmadarsi shall be

exempted, the amount already recovered from ~~to~~ the latter
being refunded to him.

Dewan's order) Ilb 5/4/08
Secretary.
4/4/1908

To,
The Dy. Commissioner,
Chitaldrug with returning
the records

The Superintendent of
Inam Settlements in mysore.

No. 4772
Sent to the Dharmadarsi in reply to
his Petn. to this Office
Ilb

Muz. 21]

47720/25-4-ಆ

ಮೈಸೂರು ಶ್ರೀಮನ್ ಮಹಾರಾಜರವರ ಗವರ್ನಮೆಂಟ್ ಮುಜರಾಯಿ ಇಲಾಖೆಯಿಂದಾ

[illegible]

ನೀವು ಹುಜೂರಿಗೆ ಜಾಹಿರ್ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡ ಮೂ ಚಳ್ಳಮೊಹ 9 ನೇ

ಮೆರ್ಕುಂ 3686 ನೇ ನಂಬರ್ ಅರ್ಜಿ ~~ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಲಾಯಿತು~~. [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[

ಮೇಲಿನ ವಿಷಯಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಸಮಸ್ತ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸುವುದೇನೆಂದರೆ ಈ ಸಂಘದ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಯನ್ನು ದಿನಾಂಕ 5/4/08 ರಂದು ಬೆಳಿಗ್ಗೆ 10 ಗಂಟೆಗೆ ಸಂಘದ ಕಛೇರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕರೆಯಲಾಗಿದೆ.

By order

5/4/08

Secretary